

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed February 24, 2005. Accordingly, enclosed is a petition to extend the time for response 3 months, together with the required fee. Also enclosed is a request for continued examination.

Claims 1, 5, 19, 21, 22, and 34 have been voluntarily amended to clarify the subject matter claimed.

Section 112 Rejections

Claim 34 has been amended to correct its dependency. Applicant thanks the Examiner for noticing the error.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1 - 9, 13, 14, 19, 21, and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Rasansky et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,960,406 ("Rasansky"). The basis for the rejections, and the Applicant's responses, have been provided previously, but clarification is required.

In particular, Applicant previously stated that Rasansky does not partition a display in two dimensions, and the Examiner disagreed. The Examiner is correct on this point; the Applicant's point was not set forth with sufficient clarity. The point was that the calendar of Rasansky, while laid out in two dimensions as calendars typically are, could just as well be laid out in one dimension, because the only variable that changes from one partition to the next is time.

In any event, additional points, beyond those made in Applicant's earlier response, are made

herein. For this purpose, claim 19 can be considered representative. The invention of claim 19 includes the steps (as amended):

“first partitioning a first display in a first dimension into a plurality of time-slots; [and]

second partitioning the first display in a second dimension into a plurality of events to be scheduled”

The display is partitioned in two dimensions into a range of values of a respective two variables, namely (a) time, and (b) event (claim 1 is more specific in this regard, by partitioning the display into (a) time, and (b) appointment). The partitioning may be visualized as a two-dimensional array of “cells,” each cell being associated with a particular value (or values) of a time variable and a particular value (or values) of an event variable. A consequence of the claimed partitioning is that unique time/event combinations are segregated into different cells, so it is not possible to duplicate unique time/event combinations.

The cells in Rasansky are calendar days, and announcements selected by a user are merely listed within the cells. A consequence of the partitioning in Rasansky is that unique time/event combinations can exist in the same cell, making it more difficult to visually inspect the display for conflicts. For example, an appointment with person A at 1:00 - 2:00 could be listed in the same cell in which an appointment at the same time with person B is also listed. It is also possible in Rasansky for the same time/event combination to be duplicated within the same cell. For example,

it is possible to list two appointments with person A at 1:00 - 2:00 in the cell in Ransansky, an error that could not occur in a display partitioned as claimed. Therefore, the claimed partitioning differs from what is disclosed in Rasansky and, moreover, differs in significant ways.

Further, claim 19 (as amended) also requires:

... [the partitioning] defining clickable spaces; and

clicking in a first selected one of said clickable spaces for selecting a first combination of said events and time-slots.

And claim 1 (as amended) requires:

clicking within a first space associated with both (a) a first set of one or more of the time-slots and (b) a first selected one of the appointments; and

coding the clicked said space with a first predetermined code to indicate selection of said first set of time-slots and said first selected appointment for scheduling said first appointment (claim 1).

The Examiner states that Rasansky discloses these features in connection with “View” records, “Slot” data, and representative icons, referring to Col. 14, lines 48 - 61, and Col. 16, lines 8 - 21. However, none of the text cited addresses either the clicking or coding features claimed.

Regarding the claimed clicking, this is recited in the context of making a selection (claim 1 uses the phrase “indicate selection” and claim 19 uses the term “selecting”). In order to make a selection, there must be multiple choices to select from. In both claims 1 and 19, those choices are provided by the partitioning. Since the partitioning identifies unique combinations of times and events, it follows that the claimed selection is between unique combinations of times and events, i.e., between one time/event combination and another time/event combination. Nothing in the text cited by the Examiner addresses whether Rasansky likewise provides for choosing between one time/announcement combination and another time/announcement combination. It is not even clear that Rasansky provides a mechanism related in any way to the calendar display for accepting one invitation, let alone choosing between one invitation and another. The Office Action presents no *prima facie* case that Rasansky discloses anything pertinent to the claimed clicking.

Regarding the claimed coding, nothing in the text cited by the Examiner indicates that the icons or formatting discussed relate to or result from selecting or clicking. While the Examiner is correct that there is coding in Rasansky, the Office Action presents no *prima facie* case that the particular coding in Rasansky is in any way pertinent to the coding that is claimed.

If the Examiner disagrees with the Applicant’s positions as articulated above, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned to schedule a telephone interview to discuss the matter.

Otherwise, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no anticipation by Rasansky, and the rejections under 35 USC §103(a) based on Rasansky in combination with Beckhardt, U.S. Patent No.

6,085,166, and Rasansky in combination with MicroSoft Outlook, are therefore moot and need not be addressed. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the examiner to allow claims 1 - 41 and pass the case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Garth Janke', written in a cursive style.

Garth Janke
Reg. No. 40,662
(503) 228-1841